

**Remarks**

In the Office Action mailed March 5, 2004:

1. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter;
2. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention; and
3. Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 13-20 were allowed.

The claims have been amended as set forth above.

I. **Selected Claims**

1. **Claim 7**

Claim 7 was amended to more particularly claim the recited apparatus.

2. **Claim 21**

New claim 21 is derived from the method recited in previous claim 7.


**CONCLUSION**

No new matter has been added with the preceding amendments. It is submitted that the application is in suitable condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested. If prosecution of this application may be facilitated through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 30, 2004

By:

  
Daniel E. Vaughan

42,199

(Registration No.)

**Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP**  
702 Marshall Street, Suite 310  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
(650) 474-1973: voice  
(650) 474-1976: facsimile